DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 963 HE 026 026

AUTHOR Elmes-Crahall, Jane
TITLE Faculty-Undergraduate Research Collaboration as a Response to the Tension of Twelve-Plus Hour Teaching Loads and Publishing Expectations.
PUB DATE 29 Oct 92
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (78th, Chicago, IL, October 29-November 1, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - General (140) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; College Students; Cooperation; Faculty Development; *Faculty Publishing; *Faculty Workload; *Financial Support; Higher Education; *Research; *Teacher Student Relationship; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS Wilkes University PA

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that the smaller teaching colleges or universities have, out of necessity, become models of maximum faculty productivity within a context of diminishing financial resources. Specifically, the paper responds to the question: How can faculty at primarily undergraduate institutions teach twelve or more hours a week and publish? First discussed are four assertions about the ways small to medium liberal arts undergraduate colleges differ from larger institutions in terms of teaching requirements and overall faculty demands. Next, a case study is presented involving Wilkes University (Pennsylvania) and the employment of a Faculty Development Committee (FDC) for fostering faculty-undergraduate student research collaboration. This is followed by an examination of a funding model used at Wilkes University involving on-campus funding for faculty-student research. Also discussed are the experiences obtained from participation in a faculty development-funded research project where students also participated in the research. The paper concludes with observations concerning the questions that were addressed before submitting a proposal to the FDC for funding, what positive outcomes came from the faculty-undergraduate collaboration, and what such collaboration has done for the students who participated in it. The appendix includes the FDC guidelines for faculty submission of proposals. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED351963

FACULTY-UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH COLLABORATION AS A RESPONSE TO THE TENSION OF TWELVE-PLUS HOUR TEACHING LOADS AND PUBLISHING EXPECTATIONS

By

Jane Elmes-Crahall, Ph.D.

Wilkes University
Wilkes-Barre, PA 18766

A paper

presented to the

Senior College and University Section of the

Speech Communication Association's Annual Meeting

October 29, 1992

Chicago, Illinois

HE026026

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jane Elmes-Crahall
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Within the past year, many of the country's large, public-funded "research" universities have come under attack for excessive administrative costs, excessive emphasis on faculty research which results in limited classroom teaching by senior faculty, and excessive tuition increases.[1] Large universities have come under attack from the families of our college students, the United States Congress, various state legislatures, private corporations and foundations, and the other constituencies that have traditionally funded higher education. A major theme in the criticism has been poor productivity by faculty, especially tenured senior faculty.

U.S. Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder, who chairs the House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families pointed about during hearings on September 14 that increased emphasis on research has reduced the number of faculty teaching hours to 6-8 per week (*Business Week*, [October 5, 1992], p. 115). Yet, as Schroeder stated, the College Board survey found "that more than half of the professors spent fewer than five hours a week in research, and a third admit to none at all. If they're not conducting research or teaching, just what are they doing?" (115). Many faculty are being asked "to increase the hours they spend with students both inside and outside the classroom," according to a recent cover issue of *U.S. News and World Report* [September 28, 1992, 102]. Yet, as Princeton University's President Harold Shapiro said, "It is not popular and exciting to talk of productivity enhancement within scholarly communities" (102).

The growing demands for accountability of public dollars spent is having an obvious impact on the larger universities. And, the recession is having an impact on private colleges, as well as smaller public institutions--those institutions that have traditionally been seen as focused on "teaching." Without the backup of public

[1] See: "A Lot Less Moola Moola On Campus," *Business Week* [October 5, 1992], 114-115; *Hearings on the House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families*, September 14-15, 1992; and "What Must Be Done," *U.S. News and World Report* [September 28, 1992], 100-110.

financing, and fewer private dollars, many private colleges have raised tuition, while freezing faculty hirings.

This paper argues that the smaller "teaching" colleges or universities have, out of necessity, become models of maximum faculty productivity within a context of diminishing financial resources. Many of our institutions serve as models of how various competing forces, or tensions in teaching, can be brought into balance. Specifically, this paper responds to the question- *How can faculty at primarily undergraduate institutions teach twelve or more hours a week and publish?*

This discussion will begin with the acceptance of several assertions about "faculty productivity" at so-called "teaching" institutions. Because the central mission of many liberal arts and small or medium sized public institutions is the education of undergraduate students, and to a limited degree graduate students, how faculty productivity is structured differs from at other larger institutions.

First of all, such colleges and universities do expect more hours of classroom contact each semester than do larger, "research" institutions.[2] At Wilkes University, which is a private, independent liberal arts institution with an enrollment of 3,400 (2,000 full-time undergraduates), the average teaching load is 12 hours per semester. Presently, the university has a task force reviewing faculty "loading" because inequities have come to light in several departments. While 12 is the average teaching load, some departments have 15 hours of teaching load each term. In fact, many faculty consider it a step in the right direction that the university recently set

[2] An unpublished Pennsylvania study entitled "Faculty Responsibility Survey 1992" was used as the basis for much of this discussion of faculty loading. Using AAUP's "prestige level" distinction, the data indicated that at level 1 schools that required research for tenure (including Univ. of Pennsylvania, Penn State, Drexel, Lehigh, etc.], over 84% of faculty taught 6-9 hours, including labs. Among levels 2 and 3 schools (including Bloomsburg University, St. Joseph's, Lafayette,Susquehanna and Wilkes), 50% of faculty teach 12 hours and 74% of the schools require research for tenure. In fact, "71% of the level 3 schools requiring 12 hours teaching also required research for tenure." See Appendix A.

it's official loading policy at a maximum of 15 contact hours per term, with no more than 6 hours of overload allowed in any academic year.

Faculty in several departments have been negatively affected by streamlining in faculty hiring. In Biology, for example, for four semesters in a row, a colleague has had a 15 hour teaching load because of two factors: (1) he is the only specialist in an area that is vital to at least three of the largest premed and preprofessional programs in his department; and (2) with a virtual freeze on new hiring, his department has not be able to hire new tenure-track faculty or full-time lab assistants.

In several other departments, such as music and nursing, tutorials and clinicals complicate the faculty loading formula. Tutorials and clinicals are expensive because the faculty member is loaded for one-to-one instruction. Yet, the alternative is counting such instruction as "overload," which usually results in less pay for the faculty member. Thus, while we expect faculty to teach between 12-15 hours per week, what constitutes "teaching" is being redefined to reflect the needs of individual programs.

Second, individual faculty in smaller departments often serve as "specialists" for entire degree academic programs, thus making the possibility of rotating teaching assignments to permit faculty research very difficult. Many faculty are expected to subordinate other aspects of faculty productivity (including scholarly activity and research) to teaching upper-level courses necessary for students to complete their programs of study. At many smaller colleges and universities there are few faculty with similar areas of expertise teaching within departments at the same time. If a faculty member goes on leave, there is an immediate impact felt by undergraduates who need particular courses in order to graduate on time. However, 74% of such colleges expected research for tenure ("Faculty Responsibility" Report). At a time when sabbatical leaves are becoming harder to get, many faculty at undergraduate

colleges can look ahead three, four, five years (or more) and predict what they will be teaching-with no sabbatical in sight! With no relief from a heavy teaching load, and little hope for a leave, it is difficult to find the enthusiasm to conduct research "on one's own time," a colleague likes to say.

Third, "research and scholarly activity" remains a very important part of faculty productivity, often ranking second only to " teaching effectiveness" in tenure and promotion criteria. Every candidate faced questions about both the number and quality of publications during tenure and promotion deliberations last year at Wilkes. Rightly so. Perhaps faculty at four-year liberal arts colleges experience a form of tension in this area that differs from the pressures placed on colleagues at two-year, or larger research-oriented, institutions. Without a second layer of faculty teaching within our areas of expertise, there is little flexibility in the number of teaching contact hours to permit other forms of productivity. And, because we are teaching juniors and seniors who must be competitive for jobs and admission to graduate schools, faculty recognize the value of staying knowledgeable about current trends in their disciplines. Thus, research activity is directly tied to the faculty member's effectiveness in the classroom; it is not seen as a criteria for tenure and promotion apart from teaching effectiveness. In addition, research is essential for tenure, promotion, and career growth. Two colleagues serve to illustrate the unique tension in teaching at a four-year liberal arts university.

A colleague in Biology is an Assistant Professor who will stand for tenure next year. For four semesters he has been carrying a 15 hour teaching load because of cutbacks in hiring "nonessential instructional staff," such as lab assistants. He is experiencing a great deal of tension now because several experiments he hoped to complete last year, and submit for publication, were deferred to teaching and lab responsibilities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

And, a colleague in my department teaches 12 hours a semester and serves as Director of the campus FM radio station. He also is an Assistant Professor who will stand for tenure next year. With approximately 50 students on staff at the radio station, he often spends 4-5 hours each day making sure the station is operating. He has been remarkably effective at introducing needed courses in audio production, media management, and film. However, he has not had time to publish or serve on campus committees. Considering all that he contributes to the Department, how vital is it that he also publishes and serves on campus committees? The senior members of the Department, myself included, have advised him that both activities are essential for tenure. Before I give the impression that our Department lacks collegiality, when a vacancy occurred on an important faculty committee, he was appointed to fill the vacancy based on our recommendation. And, with departmental faculty development support, he was able to do some preliminary research for a convention paper this past summer.

Fourth, <u>because of the central mission of a liberal arts college, many undergraduate "teaching" institutions have developed creative faculty assignments that link research to classroom teaching responsibilities.</u> Directed study abroad courses, field research classes, team-taught interdisciplinary courses, and advanced research seminars are common on many campuses. Such teaching opportunities also provide faculty with research possibilities. Many liberal arts curricula emphasize interdisciplinary learning, thus encouraging collaboration with faculty in other fields-both in the classroom and in scholarship.

WILKES UNIVERSITY'S FACULTY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS: A CASE STUDY FOR FACULTY-UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH COLLABORATION

<u>Creating A Favorable Climate For Faculty Research: Outside Funding</u>

There are approximately 150 full-time faculty at Wilkes University. At Wilkes,

because the university invested in faculty development, many faculty have benefited through retraining, improved teaching, collaborative research and teaching, and some support for research. In 1985, Wilkes received a $300,000 grant from the Pew Trust Foundation to undertake campus-wide faculty development and retraining. We were exploring a more interdisciplinary core curriculum. It had become obvious that many faculty, primarily senior faculty, would need retraining to connect their traditional teaching responsibilities with a new core that extended the boundaries of "disciplines" into new, integrated courses. In addition to preparing faculty for teaching in the new core, a peer review process was established to encourage faculty to identify research and teaching interests outside their traditional disciplines. In order to provide faculty with a strong voice in how the faculty development funds were allocated, a group of six faculty and one administrator became the steering committee for the project.

By 1987, over 60% of the faculty had participated in some form of retraining (several received degrees outside their previous areas of study, most took courses or seminars). The Pew Trust awarded Wilkes an additional $200,000 to implement the new core. As a condition of the final phase of the Pew grant, the university agreed to make faculty development a priority by building it into it's own budget and to monitor the "outcomes" of funds allocated from 1985-1988. As you might imagine, there was a period of painful transition between 1987-88.

I served on the FDC from 1985, and was Chair of the Committee during the period when we allocated over $38,000 in one year to faculty who were retraining for the core, and the following year when we had less than $7,000 to award. (From 1988-1990, Pew funds were used almost exclusively for implementing core programs such as writing and speaking across-the-curriculum, increasing the amount of professional travel money available to departments, improving academic

computing, and curriculum assessment. The FDC received no Pew funds since 1988.)

However, beginning in 1988 the Faculty Development Committee became a faculty standing committee with it's funding coming from the University's budget and not grant funds. As I said, in 1988 our working budget dropped to $7,000. At great length, we discussed the question 'At what point does retraining stop?' The FDC decided it was time to shift the focus from retraining to supporting more traditional scholarly research. We received over 20 proposals as a result of out first call for research projects. Because of severely limited funding, we awarded three "mini-grants." We also helped several others secure funding through appropriate outside agencies. One immediate result of the competitive process used by the committee was an improved quality in the proposals we received. Additionally, because we reported to the general faculty, awareness of research conducted by Wilkes faculty increased throughout the campus.

Because of the excellent quality of the three projects funded in 1988-all resulted in publications-the University promised to increase the FDC budget for the next year. Steadily, but slowly, the FDC budget has increased to its current level of $25,000. In addition, the university has been able to provide some professional travel money for each faculty member that is distributed through individual departments and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

<u>On-Campus Funding for Faculty-Student Research : A Model of Collaborative Learning</u>

Clearly, FDC funding guidelines have changed over time at Wilkes. In fact, during the past two years the FDC has ranked as top priority projects that deal with original research <u>and</u> improving the quality of undergraduate teaching by directly involving students in the process. (See Appendix A for "Guidelines For Proposals

To The Faculty Development Committee...Guidelines for Type 1 [Original Research] Proposals.") After a competitive review process, grants up to $2,500 are awarded. Typically, 10-14 projects are funded each year. Often our grants serve as seed money for outside sources of funding. The committee monitors the projects that are funded, requiring follow-up reports within six months. No additional funding will be awarded to an individual until previously-funded projects have been completed. The FDC continues to report to the general faculty, where the committee often receives support for additional funding in a forum that ensures attention will be paid by the administration.

Several recent projects partially funded by FDC serve as illustrations of the potential for both faculty and student scholarship. In Biology, three seniors enrolled in a research seminar and their instructor completed a field study of the acorn gathering habits of a particular type of grey squirrel. The results of their research were presented to a regional conference, and recently their paper appeared in a juried publication. A sociology faculty member, who teaches a research methods course, headed a research team that also included two seniors and community alcohol awareness counselor. They studied patterns of alcohol consumption on select college campuses in the region. Their pilot project was used in a grant proposal for addition funding. The U.S. Department of Education awarded the team a large grant to continue the project. So far, the project has resulted in a number of convention presentations and journal publications. And, an English professor, who is a playwright, secured FDC funding to take the students in her playwrighting class to a staged reading of one of her plays by an Equity Actors company. The students had been part of the revisions process of the script in earlier drafts. The English professor argued that they would benefit from the opportunity to see the staging of the script and by participating in the rewrites suggested by the director and actors. It

is obvious that both the faculty and students benefited from these projects.

And, this past year, along with another colleague in Communications and several undergraduate majors, I participated in a faculty development-funded research project.

"Rhetorical Studies of Anna E. Dickinson and 'Mother' Harris Jones: Leaders of the American Women's Rights Movement with Ties to Northeast Pennsylvania

During fall semester, 1991-92 I taught COM 300: Rhetorical Criticism/American Women's Rights Movement which is a required course in our Public Communication concentration. COM 300, which was also an elective in the Women's Studies program because of the designated topic, emphasized original scholarly research. Students worked on research "teams" of 2-3 on projects which involved the criticism of original texts or artifacts of the American women's rights movement. As the course progressed, interest grew in the rhetoric of women who spoke in northeastern Pennsylvania, where Wilkes is located. I hoped this local emphasis would make it easier to locate primary texts in area archives and libraries. However, because the Wilkes-Barre area experienced a major flood in 1972, the archival holdings of many regional libraries were destroyed. Nonetheless, students were able to locate some speech texts, letters, newspaper texts, and pamphlets that were useful in their rhetorical criticisms. And they found out where the bulk of the papers of the women are located.

The original texts that tied the nineteenth century orators to northeastern Pennsylvania were housed in various archival collections in Washington, D.C., New York City, and other locations. When asked if they were interested in continuing their research in Washington, D.C. two of the research "teams" enthusiastically agreed. I did not include all COM 300 students in the follow-up research because not all of the students were showing interest in the nature of historical research in public address.

And, several students were graduating and moving from the area.

The areas of research identified in the project proposal were Anna Dickinson's 1863 campaign lecture tour in Pennsylvania's anthracite coal region on behalf of the Republican Party, and Mother Harris Jones' 1903 "Children's Crusade," from Philadelphia to New York City on behalf of child labor law reform. Students working on these projects had already conducted fairly extensive searches of secondary materials, located either anthologies of discourse or identified where the discourse was housed, read available biographical materials, and studied major critical methodologies. Thus, they brought a good amount of knowledge with them as they joined the research project. I selected the students most likely to be successful researchers.

In order to make the best use of research time in Washington, D.C., a colleague who also teaches rhetoric and public address agreed to serve as one of the co-investigators on the project. He was familiar with the papers students wrote in COM 300, and was interested in doing research on Mother Harris Jones, who played a leading role in the 1902 anthracite coal strike that affected the Wilkes-Barre area. This permitted 1 faculty member to work with a 2-person student research team. Thus, our FDC proposal listed 2 faculty and three students as co-investigators. The project summary was stated in the following paragraph from the proposal:

> Travel and research funds are requested to support completion of the essays listed above. Specifically, FDC funding is needed to send faculty-student research teams to Washington, D.C. to work with the original texts of Anna Dickinson and Mother Harris Jones housed at the Library of Congress and the archives of the Catholic University. Access to the original texts is essential for the completion of this research project, which began in COM 300: Rhetorical Criticism during fall, 1991. The completed papers, with faculty and student co-authors, will be submitted to appropriate journals in communications or women's studies for possible publication.

Specifically, the project was justified by it's relationship to the university's mission in the following ways: (1) the project was closely tied to the collaborative learning stressed in COM 300: Rhetorical Criticism, and in other upper-level communicatio: classes; (2) the project emphasized working with original texts and historical, archival research; (3) the project had the potential to "recover" by means of publication several texts of two women orators who played significant roles in nineteenth century Pennsylvania, and in the American women's rights movement; (4) the project would demonstrate the importance of revising and rewriting in conducting scholarly research; and, (5) because of the subject matter, the resulting essays will contribute to communications, history, and women's studies.

The project received strong support from the Dean of the School of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences who wrote in a memo to the Faculty Development Committee: "It is a project that involves students and faculty in a collective scholarly enterprise that may lead to publication. Through an emphasis on communications and history, it also has the advantage of promoting interdisciplinary scholarship. I enthusiastically support the request." (Memo from J. Rodechko to FDC, February 24, 1992).

The Faculty Development Committee funded the project, which enabled the faculty-student teams to go to Washington, D.C. from June 18-20, 1992. Because of advanced arrangements with the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress, the Papers of Anna E. Dickinson were waiting when we arrived. Although it is not the Library of Congress's usual policy, our undergraduate student assistants were allowed into the Microfilm Reading Room, and to work with original materials, because they were under faculty supervision. We spent most of one day in the Library of Congress reading handwritten speech texts by Dickinson, and holograph copies from the microfilm reels. One of the students reviewed Dickinson's massive

scrapbooks for newspaper clippings and clues about her 2-week campaign tour in northeastern Pennsylvania. There were several moments of discovery when the students realized they were reading original correspondence to Dickinson from Susan B. Anthony, Mark Twain, and Abraham Lincoln. Most of Dickinson's papers are now available on microfilm through Inter-Library Loan, so we scanned the materials for what we needed through Inter-Library Loan.

Our visit to the Catholic University archives was not as productive. Their Mother Jones papers were uncatalogued, and often incomplete or unidentified. However, several graduate theses on Jones were housed at Catholic University, and the archivist was very knowledgeable about her writings. It took three hours for us to review their holdings on Mother Jones.

Each night we conduced debriefings at the hotel in order to summarize what we had accomplished and organize the mass of photocopied materials we were collecting. It was usually during these sessions that the students asked probing questions about how to conduct criticism or why we considered certain texts so important to our project. Quickly they understood the importance of authenticating historical documents. The discussions were every bit as instructive for the students as was the semester they spent in COM 300.

After three days in Washington, D.C. working in the archives, our research project continued at Wilkes. We immediately ordered the relevant Anna Dickinson papers through Inter-Library Loan. One of the students working with me on the Dickinson paper was working near New York City, and when we found several sources listed in the New York Public Library's holdings, she made several trips to the city to locate and copy the materials. While I continued working at the libraries of regional newspapers, the two students were transcribing various versions of Dickinson's "National Crisis" speech which she delivered throughout New England

in the spring of 1863. Her fall, 1863 campaign speech in northeastern Pennsylvania was also entitled "National Crisis." However, we learned from her papers that Dickinson freely adapted her speeches to her immediate audiences. Thus, the "National Crisis" speech she gave in Connecticut or New York in April, 1863 was not the one she delivered six months later in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania.

By the time the 10 reels of microfilm arrived from the Library of Congress in mid-July, we had narrowed our focus a great deal. Both of the students came to campus to help review the Dickinson papers on microfilm, and had a keen sense of what we were looking for. They also did historical reference checks on the many names and locations mentioned by Dickinson. After the research in Washington and Wilkes, we transcribed four versions of Dickinson's "National Crisis" speech, reviewed 10 reels from the Library of Congress, documented each stop in her 12-day campaign tour throughout our region by means of Dickinson's scrapbooks and surviving newspaper copy, and reviewed most secondary sources on her life and rhetoric.

Because our research involved so many nineteenth century newspapers, the project came to the attention of the Pennsylvania State Library's Historical Manuscript Division. The State Library is working on two projects relevant to our research--the Pennsylvania Newspaper Project and the compilation of a reference bibliography on Women in Pennsylvania's History. The newspaper project was helpful in locating articles covering Mother Harris Jones' children's march; however, Anna Dickinson's 1863 campaign speeches were harder to trace. The staff historian of the State Library has taken personal interest in our projects, especially in Anna Dickinson, whose historical contribution we introduced to her. Our essays are already included in the bibliographic document on Pennsylvania Women's History.

Opening the Door for Follow-Up Research Opportunities

By the end of the summer, the student co-authors and I each drafted rough criticisms of Dickinson's "National Crisis" speech as she delivered it in Connecticut, New York City and Wilkes-Barre. That is where the project stands at this moment. During our semester break, I will draft an essay we will submit to the journal of the Pennsylvania Speech Communication Association for review. The students will be listed as co-authors because they have been active partners and collaborators throughout the project. They will also edit the copy before it is submitted to the journal for review.

In addition, during January Wilkes will host National Honor Society Day involving several hundred Honor Society students from area high schools. One of my co-authors and I will present a summary of our research and a short workshop of "Re-discovering the Contributions of Anna Dickinson to Northeastern Pennsylvania's History." A clear theme in our presentation will be the value of rigorous research projects conducted by undergraduate students and faculty.

Based on the work we have completed on Anna Dickinson's role in Pennsylvania's 1863 gubernatorial campaign, a member of the Pennsylvania Humanities Council has encouraged me to apply for additional funding to continue research, and consider writing a new biography of Dickinson. And, the Faculty Development Committee remains a source of additional funding if I choose to focus on Dickinson's other rhetoric-such as her historic and controversial 1864 address before the U.S. House of Representatives.

Conclusions

I would like to begin this section of the paper by pointing out some possible trouble spots in conducting such projects. My concerns are primarily ethical issues-issues that had to be addressed before the project proposal took form. In fact, before

we submitted the proposal to FDC for funding, we all agreed on how to answer the following questions. Are these particular undergraduate students equipped to be collaborators in original research, designed for publication? Or, are they going to be research assistants doing mostly clerical work? How seriously will the students' analysis of the texts be considered in the final essay? How much "hands-on" teaching am I willing to do while conducting archival research, bibliographic searches, readings of texts, etc.? How much time do we have to devote ~~the~~ to the project to make sure we meet our time line? What is it the students will get out of the project? Is the university willing to extend it's liability coverage to the faculty and students traveling to other areas to conduct the research?

It is important to realize the faculty collaborator will continue to teach throughout the project. But, because of the close working relationship, the undergraduates apply what they are learning almost immediately. That makes it much easier to determine their understanding of research process and interpretation of texts. It was definitely an exercise in accelerated learning!

The positive outcomes of faculty-undergraduate research projects are many. Initially, we may not have realized how unusual this project was because there is a tradition of faculty-undergraduate research, and "hands-on" learning, at Wilkes. However, while we were at the Library of Congress, one of the students asked a question of the reference librarian who was most familiar with Anna Dickinson's papers. They spoke for some time, and then she came back and said, "Thanks, Jane." The librarian told me that he asked her basic questions to determine how well informed she was on historical research. Then he told her what a wonderful opportunity she had to work side-by-side with a faculty member who was knowledgeable about women's rhetoric. He shared with her his experiences doing such archival research on his own--as a doctoral student. My student asked why he

didn't conduct any research as an undergraduate. He told her that faculty rarely come to the Library of Congress with their students, and almost never with undergraduates.

The nature of our research project has been very interesting because of Anna Dickinson. She was dynamic, controversial and outspoken. Thank goodness she kept her notes, correspondence and scrapbooks! They are fascinating reading. The fact that many of her speeches have not been transcribed and published made our research even more important. We have the potential to contribute to what we know about one of the most famous orators of the nineteenth century whose significance has been obscured in most history and oratorical texts. Working with original texts, documenting historical events of the civil-war era by reading documents of the time, generating interest in our project by researchers at the state library, and contributing to what we know about the role of Dickinson and Jones in northeastern Pennsylvania--these are outcomes that make our research project one of the very best scholarly-teaching experiences I have had.

But, if such faculty-undergraduate research collaboration is to serve as a model for extending research opportunities for faculty at undergraduate teaching institutions, a question remains- Does my institution value such projects in terms of faculty productivity? It is difficult to provide hard data since each research project is unique. However, I do know that the Biology professor who studied acorn gathering habits with his students received both a merit award and the outstanding teacher award last year, with the research collaboration cited as evidence of his excellence in teaching. The three other faculty mentioned who have worked with student research collaborators have all received merit designations. And several of us were told that the campus Tenure and Promotion committees were impressed with our research projects that directly involved students.

What is equally important is that our students greatly benefit from participating in such projects. The students who were the original co-authors in the sociology research project are now completing their own graduate degrees. Having published research as undergraduates helped them secure fellowships at prestigious graduate schools. Several of the students presented papers before professional meetings, and returned to campus more enthusiastic about their major fields. One of the students who worked on our project is now applying to graduate schools in Rhetoric-something she would not have done if she had not spent the summer learning how to respect the art of rhetorical criticism. And, we have learned that it is a recruiting advantage to be able to show potential students what undergraduate students can do at Wilkes--work side-by-side with faculty on research projects that are important for them, the university and their professions.

APPENDIX A

"Faculty Responsibility Survey 1992," unpublished survey conducted by Joseph Ruane, Chair of Department of Social Sciences, Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science.

TABLE 4.

Teaching Load Of All Departments By Prestige* Level of School (Frequencies)

Teaching Load	Prestige 1	2	3	4	5	Row Total
3 Hours	4					4 2.1
6 Hours	17					17 8.7
7.5 hours	8	4	1			13 6.7
9 Hours	26	10	5	1		42 21.5
12 Hours	7	16	48	25	3	99 50.8
15 Hours		1	5	3	8	17 8.7
Over 15 Hours			1		2	3 1.5
Column Total	62 31.8	31 15.9	60 30.8	29 14.9	13 6.7	195 100.0

1 = Research Universities 5 = Community Colleges

Discussion: In order to better understand the practices of different level colleges and universities a ranking by "prestige level" was constructed from compensation data published in "Academe," the AAUP Bulletin. Survey data indicate that at level 1 schools * the faculty in over 85% of the departments taught 9 or fewer hours. "These level 1 schools are universities which set the standards for professional success. The expectation is that career positions in academe rise as one does more research and publishes." Looking at the first three levels of prestige one sees that 53% of faculty teach 9 hours or less per week, while 45% teach 12 hours, with the heavier load being taught in level 3 schools. Frequently these level 3 schools are small liberal arts colleges that are church-related or were once small state teacher colleges. 74% of the schools require research for tenure. Almost 71% of the departments requiring 12 hours teaching also required research. Of the 192 departments surveyed, 74.5% required research for tenure track faculty.

* level 1 schools survyed: Univ. of Pennsylvania, Penn State Univ., Drexel Univ, Lehigh Univ., Bucknell Univ., Swarthmore College, Rutgers Univ., Franklin and Marshall College.

**level 2 schools: St. Joseph's Univ., Trenton State, Lafayette, Rider, Wilkes, Widener and Fairleigh Dickinson Univ.

***level 3 schools: Allegheny College, Bloomsburg Univ., Kutztown Univ., Beaver College, Cabrini College, Susquehanna University.

WILKES UNIVERSITY
Faculty Development Committee

To : Faculty Date: August 26, 1991

From: Faculty Development Committee Subj: 1991-92 Guidelines

GUIDELINES FOR PROPOSALS TO THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
FOR THE 1991-1992 ACADEMIC YEAR

The Faculty Development Committee of Wilkes University invites faculty members to submit proposals in the following two areas:

1. Original research, especially that which engages Wilkes students and which enhances the curricula of the University; and

2. Participation in development activities such as workshops and short courses.

Support from the FDC is intended to augment departmental faculty development funds. Applicants are expected to provide evidence for availability of such funds with their proposal.

GUIDELINES FOR TYPE 1 (ORIGINAL RESEARCH) PROPOSALS

1. Proposals must follow the format appended to this document. This is intended to facilitate consideration of proposals by the Committee.

2. The project description (format, Item D) should not exceed three single-spaced pages, and should be directed to an educated lay reader.

3. The maximum funding for proposals is $2,500. Expenses associated with travel and accommodations will be limited to $500.

4. Funding will not be provided for salaries (faculty, students, or support staff), release time, attendance at conferences, or equipment not directly associated with research activities.

5. A follow-up report on funded projects must be submitted to Dr. Robert J. Heaman within six months of completion, stating whether and to what extent project objectives have been achieved. Such a report must be received prior to consideration of future proposals by an applicant.

6. Only one proposal may be submitted by a faculty member for a given semester. No faculty member will be funded beyond $2,500 for the academic year.

7. Proposals will be evaluated by the Committee once per semester. Applicants will be informed of committee decisions within one month of the relevant deadline for submission.

The original and five copies of a proposal should be submitted by 4 pm on Friday, October 25, 1991 to Katherine E. Chase, Education Department, Sturdevant Hall.